his military offenses. United States *v.* Williford (C. C. A. 1915), 220 Fed. 291.

Enlistment differs from most other contracts in that it creates a status, United States *v.* Blakeney (1847), 44 Va. 405, which can not be destroyed by showing that the recruit was at the time he enlisted an alien, United States *v.* Codingham (1843), 40 Va. 615, or above the prescribed age. In re Grimley (1890), 137 U. S. 147. It was early settled that Congress may constitutionally authorize the enlistment of minors, United States *v.* Bainbridge (C. C. 1816), 1 Mason, 71, and, at common law, the status thus created so far suspends the parental control that the minor can not thereafter be released from the service either on his own or on his parents' application. United States *v.* Blakeney, supra; Commonwealth *v.* Gamble (Pa. 1824), 11 S. & R. 93. Now, however, § 1117, U. S. Rev. Stat. forbids the enlistment of minors without the written consent of parent or guardian. This renders the enlistment voidable, not at the option of the minor, but of his parent. In re Morrissey (1890), 137 U. S. 157. But since the minor is both de facto and de jure a soldier, he is answerable for his military offenses, and his parent is clearly not entitled to his release if he has been brought under the jurisdiction of a court martial. Dillingham *v.* Booker (C. C. A. 1908), 163 Fed. 696; In re Dowd (D. C. 1898), 90 Fed. 718. Even though the jurisdiction of the court martial has not attached until after the service of the writ of habeas corpus, the better view is, as held in the principal case, that the military authorities should be allowed to punish the minor for offenses against the military law before he will be returned to the custody of his parents. Ex parte Lewkowitz (C. C. 1908), 163 Fed. 646; see In re Dowd, supra; Ex parte Houghton (C. C. 1904), 129 Fed. 239; In re Carver (1900), 103 Fed. 624.—Columbia Law Review.

Labor Union; Picketing.—The stationing by a labor union, whose members are on strike because of differences with certain breweries regarding the terms of employment, of pickets in front of the premises of a saloon keeper to inform patrons of said saloon keeper that he sold nonunion beer, is not unlawful and will not be enjoined, where the proof shows that such picketing is entirely peaceful and has in it no element of intimidation of would-be patrons. Stoner *v.* Robert, XLIII Wash. Law. Rep. 437.

Automobile Theft Insurance.—One Hiter, plaintiff below, in Federal Ins. Co. *v.* Hiter, 176 Southwestern Reporter 210, insured an automobile under a policy providing, "also against loss or damage if amounting to $25 or more on any single occasion by theft, robbery, or pilferage by any person or persons other than those in the employment, service, or household of the insured." Yost, a discharged employee, borrowed the car of Hiter, but did not return

it. Several weeks later the car was found in the state of Missouri. "It is argued by appellant that there was no actual conversion by Yost of appellee's property, so that he was deprived of the ownership thereof; that because he did not actually sell the machine there was no conversion. But, manifestly, this argument is unsound; the machine was loaned to Yost for a specific purpose, and to go to a certain place; he went not only beyond that place, but he never did in fact return the machine, but abandoned it in a remote section of a distant state in a badly damaged condition, and did not even notify appellee where it might be found, and it was not in fact recovered for some six or seven weeks after it should have been returned. This was just as effectual a conversion as if he had actually sold the machine and appropriated the proceeds. Appellant's argument, if followed to its logical end, would mean that there would have been no conversion even if Yost had retained possession of the machine for five years, just so he had not sold it. Manifestly this can not be true."

Act of Congress of December 17, 1914—Sale of Opium.—The opinion of the United States District Court, Western District of Pennsylvania by Thompson, J., holding where a physician furnishes opium to another under a written prescription, an indictment against him can not be sustained which charges him with conspiring with that other to have in the latter's possession and under his control the opium in question, although the indictment charges that the prescription was issued in bad faith. In the 8th section, which makes it unlawful for any person to have in his possession or under his control certain drugs without being registered, the word "person" should be held to apply to those who are required to register and pay the special tax, viz; those who produce, import, manufacture, deal in, sell, etc.

Fishing Rights in Overflowed Rivers.—When a navigable river overflows its banks and forms lakelets on privately owned lands, how far do public hunting and fishery rights extend? Plaintiffs in the case of Knudson *v.* Hull, 148 Pacific Reporter 1070, claimed that such rights were confined to the original river channel, while defendant claimed they also extended to the overflow waters, and so persuaded the lower court. The Supreme Court of Utah, however, held with plaintiff, and reversed the judgment.

Sherlock Holmes Outdone.—The marvelous exploits of Conan Doyle's famous character have been surpassed. A new record in deductive ability has been established. The king of sleuths has been dethroned, and by a mere woman. Holmes can unravel a mystery with a footprint as a clue. Apparently this would be child's